



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,028	03/26/2002	Isaac Cornelis Van Den Born	TS0919US	9496

7590

12/04/2002

Richard F Lemuth
Shell Oil Company
PO Box 2463
Houston, TX 77252-2463

EXAMINER

POPOVICS, ROBERT J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1724

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/089,028

Applicant(s)

VAN DEN BURN et al.

Examiner

Popovics

Group Art Unit

1724

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address -

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE Three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on March 26 2002
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some ☐ None of the:
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 3
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1724

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2,4 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Casperson (US 4,401,402).

See pump 118 and col. 6, line 68. Also see col. 1, lines 15-25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casperson (US 4,401,402).

Art Unit: 1724


Claim 3 differs from Casperson by specifying "the water poor in slag is supplied to the lower end of a first vessel." Casperson discloses introduction at an upper end of vessel 6. Absent a showing of criticality specifically associated with the point of introduction into the upper vessel, it is submitted that the selection of the point of introduction constitutes an obvious matter of choice in design.

Claim 5 differs from Casperson by specifying that "a tubular shield is present around the outlet opening of the first conduit." Casperson discloses the use of a screen 116 to prevent particles from entering conduit 112. The use of baffles to direct the flow of streams is well known in the art. An example of this is baffle 85 (col. 6, lines 28-30). It is submitted that it would have been obvious to employ a baffle (tubular or otherwise) as an alternative to screen 116, in order to prevent particles from entering conduit 112.

The various ratios set forth in claims 6-8 are parameters which those of ordinary skill in the art would have routinely optimized. In the absence of any unexpected results specifically associated therewith, they are submitted to be obvious.

5. **A complete set of the claims ("Clean Copy") is required with any response.**
6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to R. Popovics whose telephone number is (703) 308-0684.

RJP
December 2, 2002



ROBERT J. POPOVICS
PRIMARY EXAMINER